



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,667	09/18/2003	Wei Gu	MPI99-037P1RCP1CN1M	5794
30405	7590	02/10/2005	EXAMINER	LI, RUIXIANG
MILLENNIUM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. 40 Landsdowne Street CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/664,667	GU, WEI
Examiner	Ruixiang Li	Art Unit 1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7, 12, and 18, drawn to nucleic acid molecules, vectors, host cells, a method of producing a polypeptide, and a kit comprising a compound which selectively hybridizes to the nucleic acid molecules, classified in class 536, subclasses 23.5 and 24.3; class 435, subclass 320.1, 325, and 69.1.
 - II. Claims 8-10, drawn to polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
 - III. Claims 11 and 15, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.
 - IV. Claims 13 and 14, drawn to a method of detecting a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - V. Claims 16 and 17, drawn to a method of detecting a nucleic acid molecule, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
 - VI. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to a method of identifying a compound that binds to a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - VII. Claim 21, drawn to a method of a method for modulating the activity of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - VIII. Claim 22, drawn to a method for identifying a compound that modulates the activity of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. Inventions I-III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation,

different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instance case, the different inventions are drawn to completely different products, nucleic acid molecules, polypeptides, and antibodies. These molecules have completely different structures and biological functions which are not interchangeable and which require non-cohesive searches and considerations.

3. Inventions IV-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP §806.04, MPEP §808.01). In the instance case the different inventions are drawn to completely different methods each having completely different method steps, using different compositions, and having completely different outcomes. Thus, the methods are exclusive and require non-cohesive searches and considerations.
4. Invention I is related to Invention V as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, the nucleic acid molecules may be used in a materially different process such as to produce polypeptides.
5. Invention II is related to Inventions IV and VI-VIII as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another

materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, the polypeptides may be used in a materially different process such as to immunize mice to produce antibodies.

6. Invention III is related to Inventions IV and VI-VIII as product and process of use. The invention can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §806.05 (h)). In the instance case, an antibody against a polypeptide may be used in a materially different process such as to immunoprecipitate or to purify the polypeptide.
7. Invention I is an independent invention from Inventions IV and VI-VIII; Invention II is an independent invention from Invention V; Invention III is an independent invention from Invention V. The different inventions are drawn to distinct product and method inventions.
8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for a single group is not required for any other group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. Furthermore, the application contains numerous nucleic acid/amino acid sequences.

Each individual sequence represents a structural and functionally distinct entity that is capable of supporting a separate patent. The search and consideration of more than a single sequence constitutes an undue search burden on the office, given the ever-increasing size of the database.

The Examiner notes that this is not a species election requirement; rather it sets forth additional invention groups. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of an amino acid or nucleic acid sequence that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

11. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48 (b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be

accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48 (b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17 (l).

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruixiang Li whose telephone number is (571) 272-0875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached on (571) 272-0961. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at the toll-free phone number 866-217-9197.

Ruixiang Li

Ruixiang Li, Ph.D.
Examiner
February 3, 2005